



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/710,499	11/10/2000	Kevin Irlen	KIRLP001	5143

23409 7590 01/30/2003

MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH, LLP  
100 E WISCONSIN AVENUE  
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202

EXAMINER

LE, MIRANDA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2177

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/710,499

Applicant(s)

IRLEN, KEVIN

Examiner

Miranda Le

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The specification contains several spelling errors (see page 4, line 16 "even"; page 19, line 5 "my").

Please correct all such errors throughout the specification.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless:

(e) the invention was described in

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-4, 8-12, 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Aoki et al. (US Patent No. 6,253,218 B1).

Aoki anticipated independent claims 1, 8, 9, 14, 17, by the following:

Art Unit: 2177

4. As per claim 1, 14, Aoki teaches “providing at least one database comprising a plurality of data models, each of said data models containing a representation of data in a time and space relationship” at col. 2, lines 7-28.

“presenting at least one selected data model such that the information can be viewed based on spatial relationships or time relationships” at col. 34, lines 34-54, col. 38, lines 11-22, Fig. 83;

5. As per claim 8, 17, Aoki teaches “creating a database of events and sub-events, each event pertaining to the existing data model” at col. 20, line 55 to col. 21, line 6;

“connecting the events in a space and time relationship to build a modified data model” at col. 45, lines 9-23;

“linking the modified data model to other data models through one of the events to add specific context to links between the data models” at col. 41, lines 13-31, col. 43, line 65 to col. 44, line 21.

6. As per claim 9, Aoki teaches “a computer implemented method for accessing and viewing information contained within at least one data model, the data model containing a representation of data in a space and time relationship and links to related data models” at col. 2, lines 7-16.

“selecting said data model for retrieval from a database” at col. 21, lines 43-58, col. 22, lines 17-24, col. 44, lines 55-60;

“viewing said data model based on spatial relationships or time relationships” at col. 46, lines 19-26;

Art Unit: 2177

“selecting at least one linked data model for viewing” at col. 34, lines 34-54, col. 38, lines 11-22.

7. As per claim 2, Aoki teaches “providing a plurality of links between two or more of the data models, the links attached at related events located on either side of the linked data models, and presenting selected data models such that the information can be viewed based on link relationships” at col. 39, line 66 to col. 40, line 11.

8. As per claim 3, Aoki teaches “providing a link model for each of said links, the link model providing an underlying reason for the existence of the link” at col. 47, lines 40-61, col. 48, lines 11-18.

9. As per claim 4, Aoki teaches “providing a user interface so that a user can selectively access and manipulate the presentation of the data models” at col. 14, lines 22-37.

10. As per claim 10, Aoki teaches “selecting and viewing said data model comprises selecting a plurality of said data models for retrieval and viewing” at col. 34, lines 34-54.

11. As per claim 11, Aoki teaches “requesting a link model for the linked data model, the link model containing information about the relationship between the linked data models” at col. 2, lines 29-37.

Art Unit: 2177

12. As per claim 12, Aoki teaches “sending a query to the database to find an event in the data model” at col. 22, lines 25-36, col. 44, lines 1-21.

13. As per claim 15, Aoki teaches “the computer code that presents the data models is configured such that information can be viewed based on any combination of the spatial relationships, time relationships, or hierarchical relationships” at col. 13, lines 10-20, col. 13, line 38 to col. 14, line 45, col. 39, line 66 to col. 40, line 11.

14. As per claim 16, Aoki teaches “the computer readable medium is selected from the group consisting of CD-ROM, floppy disk, tape, flash memory, system memory, hard drive, and data signal embodied in a carrier wave” at col. 8, line 46 to col. 9, line 27.

15. As per claim 18, Aoki teaches “assigning a link model to each of the links, the link model providing additional detail on the reason for the existence of the link” at col. 44, line 35 to col. 45, line 23, col. 47, lines 40-61, col. 48, lines 11-17.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2177

17. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki et al. (US Patent No 6,253,218 B1), as applied to claims above, in view of Newman et al. (US Patent No. 6,046,689).

18. As per claim 5, Aoki does not explicitly teach “the data model is for a historical event”. However, Newman teaches this limitation at col. 6, lines 10-65.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Aoki with the teachings of Newman to include “the data model is for a historical event” in order to provide a method for selectively accessing and manipulating the presentation of historical information.

19. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki et al. (US Patent No 6,253,218 B1), as applied to claims above, in view of Gross et al. (US Patent No. 6,416,325).

20. As per claim 6, Aoki does not explicitly teach “the data model is for a person”. However, Gross teaches this limitation at col. 2, lines 44-60, col. 5, lines 38-58.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Aoki with the teachings of Gross to include “the data model is for a person” in order to provide a system and tool that allows presentation of the data in three dimensions and according to various parameters chosen and changed at will by the user.

Art Unit: 2177

21. Claims 7, 13, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki et al. (US Patent No 6,253,218 B1), as applied to claims above, in view of Gilbert et al. (US Patent No. 6,370,537 B1).

22. As per claim 7, Aoki does not explicitly teach “the data model is for a geographic location”. However, Gilbert teaches this limitation at col. 15, line 63 to col. 16, line 5.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Aoki with the teachings of Gilbert to include “the data model is for a geographic location” in order to provide a system and method for manipulating a data structure to allow users the ability to tie-in various discrete components of different types of data and process the collected data together.

23. As per claim 13, Aoki does not explicitly teach “retrieving a hierarchical representation of a plurality of said data models”. However, Gilbert teaches this limitation at col. 6, lines 44-62.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Aoki with the teachings of Gilbert to include “retrieving a hierarchical representation of a plurality of said data models” in order to provide a system and method for manipulating a data structure to allow users the ability to tie-in various discrete components of different types of data and process the collected data together.



Art Unit: 2177

*Conclusion*

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-3203. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

26. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax number to this Art Unit is (703) 746-7238.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Miranda Le  
Examiner-AU 2177  
January 17, 2003

  
JOHN BREENE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100